

10/524,876**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. Care has been taken to avoid introduction of new matter. Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the following comments is respectfully solicited. As a preliminary matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 13-27 are allowed. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining claims are also allowable over the cited prior art.

Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 4,544,836 ("Galvin"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Galvin does not appear to describe an information apparatus including, among other features, a retroreflecting plate, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8.

Galvin, in FIG. 1, discloses an optically-based access control system including an access card 10 and a reader 12. Galvin at col. 5, lines 7-10. The access card 10 is presented to reader 12 by the passage of access card 10 through a slot 14 in the reader housing. *Id.* Referring to FIG. 2 of Galvin, access card 10 includes a backing sheet 24 on which is provided a reflector 26. Galvin at col. 5, lines 28-33. The reflector 26 is located behind a coding area 28, which is comprised of strips 30 and 32 of oppositely polarized material. *Id.* The use of reflector 26 constitutes the reflective model in which the card can be read from one side. Galvin at col. 5, lines 33-35.

10/524,876

Although Galvin describes an information apparatus including a reflecting plate (e.g., the alleged reflector 26), Galvin does not describe or suggest an information apparatus including, among other features, a retroreflecting plate, as recited in claim 1. That is, Galvin does not describe or suggest that the alleged reflector 26 is a retroreflecting plate.

The Office Action asserts that Galvin describes this feature in FIG. 6A. *See e.g.*, Office Action at page 7, lines 11-22. In particular, the Office Action asserts that a reflector 82 in FIG. 6A of Galvin, which is illuminated with non-polarized light, reflects polarized light in the same direction as the incident non-polarized light. *Id.* Therefore, the Office Action concludes that the alleged reflector 82 can be considered retroreflective since the alleged reflector 82 returns at least part of the incident light back in the incident direction. *Id.*

Applicants disagree because a retroreflective plate is configured to reflect light so that the paths of the reflected light are parallel to those of the incident light regardless of the angle of incident.¹ Otherwise, almost any reflective surface would be automatically retroreflective as long as it is exactly perpendicular to the wave front. That is a simple mirror would be retroreflective if it is exactly perpendicular to the incident light. Here, similar to a simple mirror, the alleged reflector 82 appears to reflect the incident light back in the direction of the incident angle because the alleged reflector 82 is perpendicular to the incident angle of the light not because it is retroreflective.

Accordingly, Galvin does not describe or suggest an information apparatus including, among other features, a retroreflecting plate, as recited in claim 1. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, along with its dependent claims.

¹ A retroreflector is a device or surface that reflects a wave front back along a vector that is parallel to but opposite in direction from the angle of incidence. This is unlike a planar mirror, which does so only if the mirror is exactly perpendicular to the wave front. *See e.g.*, Wikipedia.

10/524,876

Claim 8 includes features similar to the above-recited features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8, along with its dependent claims.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Babak Akhlaghi
Limited Recognition No. L0250

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:BA/lhg
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 18, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1605997-1.070456.0074